

REMARKS

Claims 108-157 are pending in the above-captioned patent application following this amendment. Claims 2, 4-10, 14-16, 18, 23-24, 31, 33, 35-41, 44-46, 48, 52-53, 59-60 and 81-107 were rejected. Claims 2, 4-12, 14-31, 33, 35-60 and 81-107 have been canceled without prejudice and new claims 108-157 have been added by this amendment for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the goals of the Patent Office pursuant to 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (September 8, 2000), even though the Applicants believe that the previously pending claims were allowable. The newly-added claims are all believed to read on the previously elected species (Group II, Species VI). Additionally, a Request for Continued Examination was previously filed on February 13, 2006.

Support for the new claims can be found throughout the originally filed application, including the originally filed claims, the drawings and the specification. More specifically, support for new claims 108-157 can be found at least in claims 1, 6, 10-12, 16, 18, 34, 35, 39-42, 46, 48, 59-70 and 81-107, in Figures 1, 2A-2E and 3A-3C, and in the specification at page 7, line 27 through page 12, line 16, and at page 13, line 17 through page 14, line 19.

No new matter is believed to have been added by this amendment. Consideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2, 5-10, 14-16, 18, 23, 31, 35-40, 44-46, 48, 52, 59-60, 81-82, 85-87, 89-90, 93-95, 97-104 and 106-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Boutaghou et al (WO 99/05672). Claims 2, 5-10, 14-16, 18, 23, 31, 35-40, 44-46, 48, 52, 59-60, 81-82, 85-87, 89-90, 93-95, 97-104 and 106-107 have been canceled without prejudice by this amendment. Therefore the rejection of these claims is believed to be moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 24, 33, 41, 53, 83-84, 88, 91-92, 96 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Boutaghou et al (WO 99/05672). Claims 4, 24, 33, 41, 53, 83-84, 88, 91-92, 96 and 105 have been canceled without prejudice by this amendment. Thus, the rejection of these claims is believed to be moot.

New Claims

New claims 108-157 have been added by this amendment. New claims 108-157 are of a slightly different scope than the previously pending claims. However, in view of the cited reference, new claims 108-157 are believed to be allowable, as provided below.

Boutaghou et al. (including corresponding U.S. Patent No. 6,125,099) is directed toward a disk drive having a disk with improved stiffness. The disk has an internal framework of ribs disposed within the disk. (Col. 4, lines 33-38; Col. 5, lines 1-3). The Patent Office has stated in its Final Rejection that "the outer ridged section has a top surface that is fully exposed (e.g., see COL. 7, lines 38-41) within the drive housing." The Applicants respectfully disagree with this statement. The cited language does not teach or suggest exposing the outer ridged section of a stiffener. In actuality, the cited language states that "the stiffening structure may be configured to expose a substantial portion of the recording layer track locations (for example, between the ribs of the framework)." Rather, Boutaghou et al. clearly teaches that the rib structure is internal, and is not exposed or disposed on the surface of the disk. Each of the embodiments described in Boutaghou et al. clearly provides that the rib structure is disposed within another layer or layers of the disk, and is not external or exposed in any manner. (Col. 7, lines 28-41; Figures 3a and 3b).

In contrast to the cited reference, new claim 108 is directed toward a disk drive that requires "a drive housing; and an asymmetrical storage disk that is rotatably coupled to the drive housing, the storage disk including a body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region including an exposed outer flat section and a raised stiffener that increases the rigidity of the storage

disk, the stiffener extending at least approximately 0.001 millimeters away from the outer flat section.” These features are not taught or suggested by Boutaghou et al. Thus claim 108 should be allowed. Because claims 109-126 depend from claim 108, these claims should also be allowed.

New claim 125 requires “a drive housing; and an asymmetrical storage disk that is rotatably coupled to the drive housing, the storage disk including a body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region having an exposed second side surface including an outer flat section and an outer ridged section that extends at least approximately 0.001 millimeters above the outer flat section.” These features are not taught or suggested by Boutaghou et al. Thus claim 125 should be allowed. Because claims 126-140 depend from claim 125, these claims should also be allowed.

New claim 141 is directed toward a method of manufacturing a disk drive that requires the step of “rotatably coupling a storage disk to a drive housing, the storage disk having a body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region including an exposed outer flat section and a raised stiffener that increases the rigidity of the storage disk, the stiffener extending at least approximately 0.001 millimeters away from the outer flat section.” This step is not taught or suggested by Boutaghou et al. Thus claim 141 should be allowed. Because claims 142-149 depend from claim 141, these claims should also be allowed.

New claim 150 requires the step of “rotatably coupling a storage disk to a drive housing, the storage disk having a body region, a first side region that stores data and a second side region opposite the first side region, the body region being positioned between the side regions, the second side region having an exposed second side surface including an outer flat section and an outer ridged section that extends at least approximately 0.001 millimeters above the outer flat section.” This step is not taught or suggested by Boutaghou et al. Thus claim 150 should be allowed. Because claims 151-157 depend from claim 150, these claims should also be allowed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 108-157 are patentable for the reasons set forth above, and that the application is now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In addition, allowance of any generic claims results in examination of any previously withdrawn claims which depend directly or indirectly from such generic claim(s). The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 858-487-4077 for any reason that would advance the instant application to issue.

Dated this 12th day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



JAMES P. BRODER
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,514

THE LAW OFFICE OF STEVEN G. ROEDER
5560 Chelsea Avenue
La Jolla, California 92037
Telephone: (858) 487-4077